

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the office action mailed December 22, 2003. Claims 1-55 and 57-60 remain under consideration in the application. Claims 1-54 stand allowed by the examiner, and Applicant thanks the examiner for his prompt and thorough examination. Claims 32, 55, 57, and 58 have been currently amended. Claim 56 has been cancelled. Claims 59 and 60 have been newly added. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination of the application is respectfully requested.

The invention relates to stabilizing a camera by acceleration of an inertial mass such that torque induced by the acceleration acts to counter rotation of the camera. Energy for accelerating the inertial mass may be stored in a capacitor, and the inertial mass may be the core of a solenoid.

In the claims:

Claim 32 stands allowed, but has been amended to correct a minor typographical error.

Claim 55 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowland (U.S. Patent No. 4,774,589) in view of Matsuzawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,534,967). Claim 55 has been amended to add the limitation of a solenoid having a core that is accelerated to counter rotation of the camera. This change finds support in the specification at page 10, line 11 through page 11, line 3, and in Figure 5. None of the prior art cited by the examiner, taken singly or in combination, discloses all of the elements of the amended claim 55, and claim 55 is therefore believed allowable.

Claim 56 has been cancelled.

Claim 57 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowland (U.S. Patent No. 4,774,589) in view of Fujisaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,809,346). Claim 57 has been amended to add the limitation of a capacitor that stores energy for accelerating the inertial mass. This change finds support in the specification at page 11, line 1, and in Figure 5. None of the prior art cited by the examiner, taken singly

or in combination, discloses all of the elements of the amended claim 57, and claim 57 is therefore believed allowable.

Claim 58 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowland (U.S. Patent No. 4,774,589) in view of Matsuzawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,534,967). Claim 58 has been amended to add the limitation of a capacitor that stores energy for accelerating the inertial mass. This change finds support in the specification at page 11, line 1, and in Figure 5. None of the prior art cited by the examiner, taken singly or in combination, discloses all of the elements of the amended claim 58, and claim 58 is therefore believed allowable under 35 USC 103(a).

Claim 58 has also been rejected under both paragraphs of 35 USC 112. Applicant respectfully traverses both rejections. The examiner asserts that "the claim language 'an average speed measured over a predetermined preceding interval' is not found in the detailed written description" and therefore "it cannot be determined what disclosed structure supports this functional language." (paper 121003, paragraph 9) However, at page 10, lines 6-8 of the specification, Applicant describes a camera that attempts "to drive the camera rotation to its average value measured over a fixed time period, for example, the 0.5 seconds immediately preceding the taking of a photograph." While this portion of the specification does not contain the exact phrase used in the claim, each of the claim elements is present in the specification. The specification describes driving the camera rotation (clearly meaning the rotation speed) to its average value, as "measured over a fixed time period ... preceding the taking of a photograph." The "fixed time period ... preceding the taking of a photograph" is the preceding interval of claim 58.

The examiner also asserts that "it cannot be determined ... how one is to make and build" this portion of the claimed camera. (paper 121003, paragraph 9) Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art of motion control would readily be able to construct a system that drives the camera rotation speed to an average speed measured over a predetermined preceding interval. A typical university control engineering textbook such as Modern Control Engineering by Katsuhiko Ogata (Prentice Hall, 1970) describes a variety of motion control systems, including speed controls, and describes techniques for designing such systems. Because one of skill in motion control would be familiar with references such as Ogata, it is unnecessary to elaborate such techniques in the specification. "That which is common and well

known is as if it were written out in the patent and delineated in the drawings." *Webster Loom Co. v. Higgins*, 105 U.S. 580 (1881). Note that what Applicant asserts is well known to one of skill in the art is how to make this portion of the invention as described and claimed, and not any aspect of the invention itself.

Because the elements of amended claim 58 are adequately detailed in the specification and one of skill in the art could readily construct a system as claimed, Applicant believes claim 58 is allowable under 35 USC 112.

Claims 59 and 60 have been newly added. These claims find support in the specification at page 9, line 23 through page 10, line 13. None of the prior art cited by the examiner, taken singly or in combination, discloses all of the elements of new claims 59 and 60, and these claims are therefore believed allowable.

Applicant believes this application is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By David W. Boyd
David W. Boyd
Reg. Number 50,335

28 January, 2004
Fort Collins, CO 80528
(970) 898-4475